DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 150 921 HE 009 662

AUTHOR Haughey, Edmund J.
TITLE A Study of the Academic Advising System of Bridgewater State College -- Spring 1976. Learning Theory and Applications.
PUB DATE 16 Sep 76
NOTE 53p.; Ed. D. Practicm, Nova University

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Career Planning; *College Freshmen; College Majors; *Counseling Effectiveness; *Counselor Evaluation; Counselor Role; *Faculty Advisors; Higher Education; *Participant Satisfaction; Questionnaires; School Surveys; *Student Attitudes; Student Teacher Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *Bridgewater State College MA; Department Chairpersons

ABSTRACT

This practicum is a study of the student's perceptions of the effectiveness of the academic advising system at Bridgewater State College in the spring semester of 1976. The questionnaire used in the study was distributed at pre-registration for the fall semester to randomly selected students in the freshman and junior classes. The freshman respondents indicated they were pleased with the academic advising of the college, were strongly supportive of the department chairmen, were aware of the assistance available from the Coordinator of Academic Advising, were strongly aware they had entered without a declared major, and preferred to be counseled by faculty rather than staff or students. They did not prefer a more structured program, were less aware of assistance from the Career Counseling Center, and were negative in their responses to their discussions on the choice of major and career plans. The junior respondents indicated they were pleased with the departmental advisers on matters of academic policies, general college and major requirements, as well as assistance from the department chairmen. They were rather evenly divided on the advisers' advice on choice of major and career plans as well as the availability of the Coordinator of Academic Advising for assistance. They did not prefer a more structured program, were generally unaware of assistance from the Career Counseling Center, and were negative in their overall appraisal of the academic advising of the college. (Author/SPG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

H

ED150921

A STUDY OF THE ACADEMIC ADVISING SYSTEM OF BRIDGEWATER STATE COLLEGE -- SPRING 1976

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Edmund J. Haughey

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

LEARNING THEORY AND APPLICATIONS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

by

Edmund J. Haughey

Bridgewater State College

A PRACTICUM PRESENTED TO NOVA UNIVERSITY
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

NOVA UNIVERSITY

September 16, 1976

HE009 662

ABSTRACT

This practicum was a study of the students' perceptions of the effectiveness of the academic advising system of Bridgewater State College in the spring semester of 1976. A previous study in 1974 had revealed weaknesses in the system with specific complaints against the faculty advisers ranging from a lack of availability, to disinterest, to erratic advice, to inadequate assistance in career planning. In terms of Bridgewater State College this study had as its intention the providing of input to the Academic Standing Committee on how the system has been working and how it might be strengthened.

The questionnaire used in the study was distributed at pre-registration for the fall semester, a time judged most suitable for such an evaluation in that most of the students had their closest contacts with the advising system at that time. The students were chosen at random from among the freshman and junior classes. When the questionnaires were tabulated a comparison was made of the perceptions of the present freshmen and juniors as well as the present juniors to their reactions as freshmen by using a chi-square test at the 5% level of significance.

The freshman respondents indicated they were pleased

with the academic advising of the college, were strongly supportive of the departmental advisers' assistance and that of the department chairmen, were aware of the assistance available from the Coordinator of Academic Advising, were strongly aware they had entered without a declared major, and preferred to be counseled by faculty rather than by staff or students. They did not prefer a more structured program, were less aware of assistance from the Career Counseling Center and were negative in their responses to their discussions on the choice of major and career plans.

The junior respondents indicated they were pleased with the departmental advisers on matters of academic policies, general college and major requirements, as well as assistance from the department chairmen. They were rather evenly divided on the advisers' advice on choice of major and career plans as well as the availability of the Coordinator of Academic Advising for assistance. They did not prefer a more structured program, were generally unaware of assistance from the Career Counseling Center and were negative in their overall appraisal of the academic advising system of the college.

In the comparison of the 15 questions shared in common by the freshmen and juniors in the 1976 survey the results showed significant differences at the 5% level in four questions: the first, where the freshmen indicated pleasure with the academic advising system and

the juniors did not; the second, on the advisers' helpfulness with career plans, the juniors were evenly divided while the freshmen were negative; the third, the difference on when they sought advice, the freshmen indicated primarily "prior to registration" and the juniors "various times"; fourth, on their awareness of the Career Counseling Center the freshmen indicated they were less aware of the Center than the juniors.

The results of the seven questions answered by the juniors in the 1974 and 1976 questionnaires revealed through four of the questions a significant difference at the 5% level. The first, on the question of pleasure with academic advising, represented a negative answer for this year whereas the 1974 survey answer was positive; the second; on the advisers' knowledge of general college requirements the juniors were more positive in the 1974 study; the third, as to whether the students were in the right major, the juniors were much more positive this time, and fourth, on from whom they received the most useful advice, they found the faculty in 1976 rather than the students as in the 1974 survey.

It would be recommended, first, that the departments be encouraged to continue to develop up-dated check off sheets for their majors. Secondly, in light of the clear preference of the students for faculty advisers it would be recommended that the faculty from the Secondary Education Department be used to lighten the advising

load of other departments within the division. Thirdly, in cooperation with the student government, every effort will be made to draw more attention to the assistance available at the Career Counseling Center. Fourthly, it would be recommended that each department hold periodic meetings with their majors on the career options available to them as well as the implications of the students' choice of major.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES iii

Chapter

1. INTRODUCTION 1
2. BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE 3
3. PROCEDURES 16
4. RESULTS 21
5. DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 32

BIBLIOGRAPHY 39

APPENDIXES

A. FRESHMEN QUESTIONNAIRE 42
B. JUNIOR QUESTIONNAIRE 44

LIST OF TABLES

Page

Table

1. Adjusted frequency percentage of freshman class for all respondents questionnaire 1976 22

2. Percentage of freshman perceptions for respondents who answered questions in 1976 survey 23

3. Adjusted frequency percentage of perceptions of junior class for all respondents questionnaire 1976 26

4. Percentage of junior perceptions for respondents who answered questions in 1976 survey 27

5. Results of chi-square test on 15 questions crosstabulated by year for commonly shared questions for freshmen and juniors 1976 survey 28

6. Results of chi-square test on 7 questions crosstabulated by year for commonly shared questions of present junior class with their responses in 1974 survey 29

I. INTRODUCTION

This practicum is a study of the student's perceptions of the effectiveness of the Academic Advising system of Bridgewater State College, a system which was inaugurated in the fall of 1974. The system functions through a Coordinator of Academic Advising, the Faculty and the department chairmen. The office of Coordinator of Academic Advising was established in the spring of 1974 with the avowed purpose of facilitating the academic advising of the college.

The nature of the problem under study in this practicum is how to most effectively assist the student when he has need of academic advice. Since people learn at different rates and in different ways a system which purports to offer such advice must be flexible enough to make this accomodation. Before the new system was begun in 1974 academic advice was generally limited to periods of registration when the chairmen were required to sign the students' course cards prior to registration. In the larger departments this often became a rubber stamp process performed by a secretary. As a result of the recommendations of the Academic Standing Committee and the Faculty Council the Coordinator of Academic Advising with the cooperation of the department chairmen assign each student an advisor from their major department.

In the fall of 1974 a study was conducted of the

Freshman and Junior classes to determine their reaction to the new system. These classes were chosen because the Juniors had been advised under the old system, while the Freshmen had not, and it was felt that both groups could provide valuable insight to the new program. The intent of that study as well as this one was to provide input to the Academic Standing Committee and the Faculty Council on how the system is working and how it might be strengthened. The students' perceptions in the fall of 1974 revealed discontent with the advising system with the complaints ranging from a lack of availability, erratic advice, disinterest, to a weakness in career planning. The recommendations called for better record keeping, distribution of advising load and assistance with career planning, of which only the recommendation on distribution has not been satisfactorily implemented.

A questionnaire for the present study was distributed at pre-registration for the fall semester, a time judged most suitable for such an evaluation in that most of the students have their closest contacts with the advising system at that time. The students were chosen at random from among the freshman and junior classes. When the questionnaires were tabulated a comparison was made of the perceptions of the present freshmen and juniors as well as the present juniors to their reactions as freshmen by using a chi-square test at the 5% level of significance.

II. BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

A review of the literature reveals that academic advising presents a vexing problem. Jane Matson suggests that the question of whose responsibility it is, faculty or professional counselor, remains hypothetical with only vague and questionable data to support it.

> The assignment of prime responsibility for the academic advisement function to the teaching faculty remains a controversial issue... As the college grows in size and budget, it is not uncommon for the advisement function to be shifted entirely to the counseling staff. The next stage of development occurs when the faculty are again given the responsibility for academic advisement. At this point the rationale is likely to be that this arrangement facilitates good faculty-counselor relationships or that it improves faculty- student communication or that it is impossible to maintain a reasonable counselor-student ratio without resorting to a faculty advisement system. The argument is also used that faculty are generally better equipped than the professional counselor to provide superior advisement service. Perhaps each of these is a reasonable hypothesis, but neither has been well evaluated and therefore, remains merely a hypothesis with only vague and questionable data to support it. What is needed is a good evaluation study of the advantages and disadvantages of the use of faculty advisers in a variety of college settings. Until this is done practice will continue to swing on a pendulum and will be justified on opinions, frequently more emotional than rational.[1]

Several studies suggested the difficulties involved in faculty advising. Melvene D. Hardee reflected on some of the negative views of faculty advising: "The view that, since there are counselors on campus, the

---

[1] Terry O'Banion and Alice Thurston, Student Development Programs in the Community Junior College, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1972, 173.

teachers can leave to them most student problems, especially concern for the 'whole student'. The faculty member can be concerned only with lectures, examinations, and scholarly papers.... The view that faculty advisement takes badly needed time away from teaching, and the teacher is too swamped trying to be a good teacher to be able to be an adviser to students also." [2] Borland cited three causes of failure of faculty advising: the first that such advising is based on the authority of the adviser and is prescriptive thus not allowing students the opportunity to exercise responsibility; the second that concern for effective advisers has been exclusively focused on the progress toward goals of students rather than the personal and professional growth that might be accrued by faculty members in the advising relationship; thirdly, the problem of a standardized curriculum -- completion of which is required of all students and the administration of which is required of advisers. Borland's formula for correction would be an individualized curricula and an individualized advising system. [3] Still on the negative side, J. R. Robertson described faculty advisement as a "semi-annual herding of drafted faculty into an armory or gymnasium to plea programs and to approve election cards for students they do not know and for whom they have no continuing responsibility." [4]

---

[2] Melvene D. Hardee, Faculty Advising in Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C., American Personnel and Guidance Association, 21.

[3] David Borland, "Curricular Planning Through Creative Academic Advising", NASPA Journal 10:211-17.

[4] J. R. Robertson, "Academic Advising in Colleges and Universities--Its Present State and Present Problems", North Central Association Quarterly, 32, 1958, 228-39.

This after a twenty college visit to check on academic advisement. Donk and Getting at Colorado State University found that only twenty-five percent of 366 faculty members responding felt that the faculty advisement system was effective. [5] Twyman Jones wrote that "There is a general consensus that as a total group, members of the teaching faculty perform miserably when attempting to advise students relative to course selection, proper sequencing of courses, graduation requirements, etc." [6] He suggested that such failure is traceable to lack of in-service training plus disinterest on the part of some advisers.

Positively, in one of the few longitudinal studies available research on Georgia Tech students seven years after revealed a trend for counseled students to either overcome or diminish factors that earlier differentiated them from non-counseled students. The counseling was generally for academic or vocational reasons. [7] Again, at the University of Wisconsin at Green Bay it was found that efforts to bring the counselors to where the students were was successful in so far as it emphasized the freedom of choice open to students while making them aware that assistance was available to them to help make decisions. [8] In a study of 200 junior college counseling

---

5 Leonard J. Donk and Eugene R. Getting, "Student-Faculty Relations and the Faculty Advising System", Journal of College Student Personnel, 1968, 9:402.

6 Twyman Jones, "The Counselor and His Role", Junior College Journal, 1970, 40:12.

7 Mark E. Meadows, "Assessment of College Counseling: A Follow-Up Study", Journal of Counseling Psychology, Vol. 22, No. 6 1975, 463.

8 H. Spille, G. Stein, "Academic Advising Reaches Out", The Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol.53,No.1, 1974, 61.

centers it was concluded that although the counseling process is a key component in promoting the development of necessary attitudes and skills the entire educational system must support the acquisition and expression of such attitudes and skills if students are to assimilate them and in particular with the emphasis that the students can direct their own careers based on a sense of self esteem while at the same time acquiring the necessary information and pursuing study skills for their development. [9]

Two studies which were supportive of the counselor approach to academic advising were by Ravekes and Shelton. Ravekes had the following conclusions: "The staff and students feel that the revised faculty advising system is appropriate for Essex Community College. The basic concept of continuing students being free to choose their own method of advisement with counselors and faculty being available on a self referral basis, certain faculty members being designated as faculty advisers and self-advising curriculum guides being provided will remain. Certainly the data indicates that many students could adequately advise themselves and prefer this method." [10] Joe B. Shelton found that "counselors are significantly more concerned about students, more accepting of students, more genuine with students, more approachable to students, and more effective in meeting the advisement need of

---

[9] Charles Healy, "Furthering Career Education Through Counseling", The Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 52, No. 10, 1974, 657.

[10] John E. Ravekes, "Development and Evaluation of Essex Community College's Revised Academic Advising System", NASPA Journal, 8:242.

students, than are faculty advisers. Based on the results of this study, it is recommended that colleges utilize more trained counselors in their advisement programs. It is also recommended that colleges make greater efforts to provide adequate advisement for the younger, beginning student." [11]

In a study supportive of peer counseling Coke Brown cites studies which are of interest to the general problem addressed by this practicum.

> "The first by Zunker and Brown showed that students counseled by students in their study received better grades than those students who were counseled by professional counselors. Rossman (1967, 1968) found that faculty given released time for advising did not seem to improve academic achievement for their advisees when compared to other faculty. Morehead and Johnson (1964) found, for faculty advised students, that more required contacts resulted in better academic performance for advisees. Juola, Winburne and Whitmore (1968) reported that students who were on probation who voluntarily came in for special advising and were advised to take easier courses did better than probationary students who did not come in for such advising." [12]

Brown's study itself considered that present faculty to student ratios demand modification of the traditional advisement relationship. At Idaho the stated purpose of curriculum advising is to insure that students have access to information concerning curriculum requirements, advice on courses of study as well as academic requirements. His study saw that students advised by students

---

11 Joe B. Shelton, A Comparison of Faculty Academic Advising and Academic Advising by Professional Counselors, Educational Resources Information Center. ED 065 088, (Johnson County Community College, Shawnee, Mission, Kansas, 1972), 1.

12 Coke R. Brown, Evaluation of a College Curriculum Advisory Program Utilizing Student Advisers, Educational Resources Information Center, ED 063 906, (Idaho U. Pocatello, Idaho, 1972), 5.

did as well academically and had a lower dropout rate than students advised by faculty. [13] Brown's support of peer counseling was reinforced by Scott and Warner who cited five favorable studies where trained peers were used to help college students with their academic problems: Murry (1972) found that peer tutoring and individual counseling significantly improved high-risk students' chances of succeeding academically and remaining in school; In Luther's (1972) study the grade point averages and self-esteem of marginal students were improved, while Michaud (1971) and Upcroft (1971) also found peer counseling to be effective. While Scott and Warner reported from other studies of peer counselors which reported positive results they particularly cited a 1970 study of Ware and Gold which found that peers from the same ethnic and socioeconomic background were effective. They concluded that peer counselors were most effective in areas of academics such as study habits, curriculum choice and educational goals. [14] In a paper delivered at the NASPA conference at Dallas on March 29, 1976 by Douglas and Hallenbach on resident assistants at the University of Georgia there was considerable enthusiasm generated by the presentation of their paper

---

13 Ibid, 1. (Also reported in Journal of College Student Personnel, 1975, 226-231, under title "Student vs. Faculty Curriculum Advising".)

14 Stephen Scott, Richard Warner, "Peer Counseling" The Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 53, No. 3, 1974, 228-31.

which was very favorable to peer counseling. [15]

Two studies might be noted on choice of major and faculty advisement. In the first, a Nova practicum by Edward Alfaro and others, it was found that the "results of the analysis of the data showed that educational advisement of entering freshmen, whether from instructors or credentialed counselors, had no significant influence on the student's commitment to his originally selected program major". [16] A paper read at the Southwestern Psychological Association based on a study at Kansas State dealt with analytic and intuitive items of importance in a choice of major. The advisers' ideal student response and their perception of the typical sophomore response were both more analytical than was the actual sophomore response. Of particular interest to this study was their misperceptions of sophomores' thinking may explain that 38% of the students written descriptions cited faculty advisers as a factor in the choice of major. [17] One might note that at Northern Virginia Community College in a study of 51 full-time faculty and 602 students it was implied that the degree of interest the faculty had in advising did not affect the way they

---

15 Dwight Douglas, Daniel Hallenbech, "The Resident Assistant as Academic Advisor: A Model Program for Efficient Student Development", NASPA, Mimeographed Copy, March 29, 1976. (Should be available in "Conference Issue" of NASPA Journal, Summer, 1976).

16 E. Alfaro and others, A Comparative Study of Academic Advisement by Instructors and Credentialed Counselors Related to Freshmen at Two Community Colleges, ERIC ED 094 807, (Nova U,, Fort Lauderdale, Florida, 1974).

17 S. R. Baumgardner and L. Rappoport, "Conflicts in Career Thinking: Analytic Advisors and Intuitive Students", Paper at Southwestern Psychological Assoc., El Paso, May 1974, 17 pp.

performed this task.[18] Positively, Beverly Gelwick at Stephens College studied faculty training for advisement which included vocations as well as academic work with the results suggesting that faculty advisors do welcome training for such advisement and that the faculty are motivated and rewarded when performing effective advising.[19] Finally, in line with the newly developed Career Counseling Center at Bridgewater State College an article by Hadley suggests that because some advisors do not feel comfortable in helping students plan vocations which are different than their own, an Office of Career Planning may be a better source of help for undecided students. Thus counselors are able to help provide vocational information of which the faculty are unaware.[20]

Through these diverse reports on academic advising, it is clear that no one system of faculty advising has proven beneficial. It is clear that the numbers of students being advised, faculty attitudes, financial repercussions all play a part in whether a system is effective. The present study has taken into account the negative reactions of Borland, Donk and Getting, Hardee and Jones that faculty advisement has by its very nature problems which must be overcome and it was with that in mind that the Academic

---

18 C. H. Sanborn and W. L. Taylor, "Predicting Faculty Interest in Student Advising in the Community College", Research in Higher Education, 1975, 3, 67-75.

19 Beverly Gelwick, "Training Faculty to Do Career Advising", The Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 53, No. 3, 214-217.

20 Everett E. Hadley, "Helping Faculty Advisers Deal with Vocational Indecision," Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 1975, 23, 232-236.

Standing Committee and Faculty Council have sought feedback on the program. The questionnaire used in this study specifically addressed the issues raised by Jones in questions 3 and 7, by Baumgardner and Rappoport in question 5, by Gelwick and Hadley in question 6, by Borland and Hardee in question 11, by Brown , Scott and Warner in question 12, by Hadley in questions 14 and 15, and finally by Ravekes and Shelton in question 19. It was the intention of this present study that the major issues raised by the literature, e.g., faculty knowledge as to requirements, major, career planning be raised as well as to assess the student perceptions on the desireability of a more structured program which would reduce the need for advising. On a parallel line there was the desire to relate the students' perceptions, viz. a viz., the desireability of peer advising in light of the very favorable peer advisement programs cited in the literature. Certainly Jane Matson's initial comment that much has to be known about the faculty and academic advising became even more evident after having reviewed the literature. At the same time these articles provide a firm base on which to study the problem with an eye toward a stronger program which would be of assistance to the students.

In the context of "Learning Theory and Application" this study was intended to strengthen the academic advising system of the college so that learning could be facilitated. In a recent speech before the American

Association of Higher Education, Alison Bernstein of the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education questioned the effect of the size of an institution on the education of many students. She cited the frustration, cynicism and alienation of students in such institutions and suggested there is a need to do a better job by creating meaningful and manageable learning environments.[21] Such a suggestion rests on the principle cited by Symonds that psychology would teach that motives for most human learning reside in the interpersonal relationship, for it is acceptance and approval that human beings most crave.[22] Thus the academic advising system seeks to promote learning by knowing as well as possible the characteristics of the learner and relating them to the student's need for assistance in course selection and career choices. As Losak points out of prime consideration in the application of learning theory is the long-established fact of individual difference. "People learn at different rates and in different ways, rendering a curriculum which does not allow for them detrimental to optimal learning."[23] Thus the more personal the advising system the more the student will be served. If, as a result of this practicum the advising system is strengthened

---

21 The Chronicle of Higher Education, May 17, 1976, 32.

22 Percival M. Symonds, What Education Has to Learn From Psychology, (3rd Edition) New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1970, 9.

23 John Losak, Learning Theory and Application, Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova University, 1974, 41.

it will be because principles of learning will have been incorporated into the process. In some instances the advisor will be able to relate prescribed courses so that the educational experience becomes appropriate for his advisee rather than a subject matter which seems apart from the student with little transferability to new learning situations. If the principle is followed that learning will effectively transfer when the situation to which it is to transfer is real to the learner then it must be suggested that the advisor must deal with his advisee with this in mind. In other instances the advisor will be able to provide the reinforcement which is so important, the reassurance that the continual effort on the part of the student will be rewarded. Additionally, in advising some of the students the advisor will be able to supplement value orientations so that the student who has not acquired particular value orientations in his home and community may compete more successfully with those students among whom these values are implicitly taken for granted. Similarly, a strong advisor-advisee relationship will lead to a self-fulfilling prophecy which would strengthen the student in his attitude toward learning. Finally, as suggested by Knowles, if the advisor provides a situation which is conducive to interaction, the learning environment will be one of mutual trust and respect, mutual helpfulness, freedom of expression and acceptance of differences.

Finally, it is necessary to place this study in the perspective of Bridgewater State College. At Bridgewater, the Office of Coordinator of Academic Advising was established two and one half years ago. Its purpose is to facilitate the academic advising of the college. As a result of the action of the Academic Standing Committee and the Faculty Council, each student has been assigned an advisor from the student's major department. This has been coordinated through the Coordinator of Academic Advising. Each department has been asked to develop materials and procedures which will facilitate this advising and the Office of the Registrar has proveded excellent guidelines for the general college and major field requirements. Since the last study the student government has opened a Career Guidance Center, an area of evident weakness in the last survey. Additionally, the college policy now causes students to be admitted in an area of interest with a declaration of major in the second semester of the freshman year and there was concern as to whether the freshmen understood the process and whether their departments were of assistance to them in their choice. The questionnaire of this study sought to provide data upon which an assessment might be made of these areas by the Academic Standing Committee and the Faculty Council. Each of these latter groups were concerned that the advisement system be strengthened. This emphasizes the point made by Healy in the review of literature that the entire institution must support any

such system of advisement if it is to be effective.[24] Further, as Matson suggested, in an institution with only one designated advisor, (counnselor), it is impossible to maintain a reasonable counselor-student ratio without resorting to a faculty advisement system.[25]

---

24 Charles Healy, op. cit., 657.

25 Jane Matson, op. cit., 173.

III. PROCEDURES

By a vote of the Academic Standing Committee and the Faculty Council, students are required to have their advisors sign their course pre-registration cards, a copy of which is retained by their advisor. This being so, it seemed that the best time to survey the students would be after they had seen their advisors. The best opportunity to do this was at pre-registration which took place for Juniors on Wednesday, May 5th, and for Freshmen on Friday, May 7th.

The decision to distribute the questionnaire to the Freshmen and the Juniors was based on the notion that Freshmen, by their newness to the institution, generally need more direction in their choice of courses, especially in new subject areas and that Juniors have already entered their major field of study and still have a stake in the institution. Additionally, the previous study had been conducted on the same basis and it would provide a basis for comparison on whether any change had occurred in the two-year period.

The students were chosen at random during the pre-registration process and the questionnaires were distributed to more than 100 students of the Freshmen and Junior classes so that at least 100 completed questionnaires would be received from the Freshmen and Junior classes. Upon the advice of the reader of the practicum proposal

the number 100 was chosen as appropriate to the study.

The questionnaire itself was a refinement of the instrument developed for the previous study. Following a recommendation of the reader of the practicum proposal the students were given five response choices instead of three while at the same time adding the important dimension of "not applicable". Additionally, more specific wording was used to remove any possible ambiguity, such as in question 12 wherein the term "useful" was related to a precise area. Further, since the previous instrument two dimensions had been added to the advising program. A career counselor is available and in cooperation with her five questions were developed which examined an area which had been a severe problem in the fall of 1974. The questionnaire also included questions for the freshmen on the declaration of major, a new process inaugurated this year where by the freshmen entered the college without a definite decision on their choice of major. Lastly, the questions were developed in relation to inquiries of the various committees of the college and the outcomes of the studies cited in the review of the literature. In this way it was felt a broader perspective could be brought to the particular problem of Bridgewater State College.

In comparing the reactions of the present juniors to their reactions as freshmen a chi-square test was used to compare the same seven questions which they answered on both questionnaires. Similarly, in the present questionnaires

a comparison of the reaction of the present freshmen and juniors was made through the use of a chi-square test at the 5% level of significance for the fifteen questions which they shared in common. [1] As a result of these tests and the total comparison of the two surveys specific recommendations will be made to the committees of the college. Of particular concern is whether the students would prefer their academic advising from faculty or counselors or trained fellow students, whether they are aware of the assistance available to them from the career counseling center or the coordinator of academic advising, whether they seek a return to a more structured curriculum which would require less academic advising, and whether they believe the present system is working to facilitate the learning process. On this last point questions 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7 have been prepared to seek out the possible source of discontent.

Assumption: The underlying assumption of this study was the concern of the administration and the faculty, which had been echoed by the students, that a more effective academic advising system be developed. Inasmuch as the present system had been put into practice in response to this demand, there was recognition that problems would be connected with the system. Thus, part of the interest of the survey was to find out areas of student concern, part to find out whether areas of weakness found

---

[1] Norman Nie, Hadlia Hull, Jean Jenkins, Karin Steinbrenner, Dale Bent, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975, 223-4.

in the first study had been strengthened so that learning might be facilitated. It is clear that there is general good will on the part of the faculty and that the students do want the hel

Limitation: The questionnaire for reasons cited previously was distributed to the freshman and junior classes. Both classes still have a stake in the advisement system while at the same time they provided a basis for comparison with the previous study as well as an opportunity to gauge the impact of students new to the college's procedures, freshmen, in contrast to juniors. For the freshmen the system offers assistance in a proper start in the choice of courses and career assistance, while for the juniors the proper function of the system helps to address the reaffirmation of their choice of major and proper selection of courses within the major. Additionally, for the juniors there is the awareness of the assistance that may be derived from the faculty as they progress ever closer to graduation and graduate school or a job.

Definition of Terms:

General College Requirements: requirements of forty-five hours distributed throughout the various academic disciplines so that students will study a variety of disciplines during their college career.

Departmental Advisor: faculty member from the department of the student's area of interest or major who is assigned to assist the student in academic matters.

Coordinator of Academic Advising: staff associate

with responsibility to coordinate faculty advisors and be available for advice to students on academic matters.

College Staff Member: refers to all staff associates who are not part of the instructional faculty.

Counseling Office Staff: Coordinator of Academic Advising, staff of Registrar's and Student Services offices.

Career Counseling Center: office sponsored by student government with career counselor available.

Area of Interest: for freshmen who enter the college in the subject area of their interest and are assigned advisors from that discipline.

Professional Staff: counselor employed full-time for counseling, not a member of the teaching faculty.

IV. RESULTS

In seeking to report the results of this study 6 Tables have been assembled which summarize the data of the survey. So that the findings might be analyzed in an orderly fashion Table I and Table II represent the tabulated results for the 111 freshmen in the present 1976 survey, Table III and Table IV represent the tabulated results for the 106 juniors in the present 1976 survey, Table V the results of the chi-square test for a comparison of the tabulated responses for the 15 questions which the freshmen and juniors commonly answered in the 1976 survey, and Table VI the results of the chi-square test for a comparison of the tabulated responses for the 7 specific questions which the present juniors replied to in both the 1974 and 1976 surveys. As reported in the procedures section the computer crosstabulation and chi-square tests were from the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, Voyebach Computing Center, Northwestern University, version 6.00, April 1, 1975.

Table I and Table II should be considered together because they present the freshmen responses with Table I representing all five categories for the first 11 questions including, in particular, the 'not appropriate' column as well as the tabulated responses for all questions and Table II providing the percentage distribution

Table 1. Adjusted frequency percentage of perceptions of freshman class for all respondents questionnaire 1976.

Question	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicabl
1.	50.5	9.1	30.3	5.5	4.6
2.	57.3	26.4	10.9		5.5
3.	62.4	28.4	4.6	.9	3.7
4.	50.9	36.1	4.6	3.7	4.6
5.	25.5	9.4	28.3	14.2	22.6
6.	23.8	5.7	30.5	13.3	26.7
7.	34.6	13.1	7.5	3.7	41.1
8.	21.7	12.3	7.5	3.8	54.7
9.	46.7	3.7	25.2	8.4	15.5
10.	39.6	10.8	33.3	11.7	4.5
11.	18.5	5.6	45.4	25.9	4.6

12. Advisor 46.8 Other Faculty 8.3 Students 41.3 Counseling Office 3.7

13. Almost Never 9.9 Prior to registration 57.7 Various times 32.4

14. Yes 42.3 No 57.7

15. A lot .9 Sometimes 2.7 Not at all 96.4

16. Yes 76.6 No 23.4

17. Yes 23.4 No 76.6

18. Yes 74.2 No 25.8

19. Department 62.7 Staff 37.3

20. Division 55.5 Student 44.5

Table II. Percentage of freshman perceptions for respondents who answered questions in 1976 survey.

Question	Agree	Disagree
1.	62.5	37.5
2.	88.5	11.5
3.	94.3	5.7
4.	91.3	8.7
5.	45.1	54.9
6.	40.3	59.7
7.	80.9	19.1
8.	75	25
9.	60	40
10.	52.8	47.2
11.	25.2	74.8

positively and negatively of those who responded to the first 11 questions.

To begin with, the questions which the freshmen felt least applied to them were those concerning the adviser and college policies and assistance obtained from department chairmen,. with 41.7 and 54.7 percent listed in the 'not appropriate' column for these questions. Essentially, the freshmen were pleased with the academic advising of the college with 62.5 percent favorable, were strongly supportive of the departmental adviser's assistance, 88.5% and 94.3%, when they did seek the assistance of the chairmen they did find them helpful, 75%, were aware of the assistance available from the coordinator of academic advising 60% and did not prefer a more structured program 74.8%. They were somewhat ambivalent on the question of preferring their adviser to others when seeking advice, 52.8%, primarily sought advice at registration time, 57.7%, and preferred to be counseled by faculty rather than by staff, 62.5%, or students, 55.5%. They responded negatively to their discussions with their advisors on the choice of major, 54.9%, and career plans, 59.7%.

In the first of the two areas which were new in this survey, the freshmen indicated they were less aware of the assistance available from the Career Counseling Center, 57.7%, and indicated with the strongest percentage of any answer, 96.4%, that they had not used

the Center. As to the second they were strongly aware that they had entered without a major, 76.6%, just as strongly did not seek out their adviser for this choice, 76.6%, but for those who did the advice of the adviser was deemed helpful, 74.2%.

Table III and Table IV should be considered together because they represent the juniors' responses with Table III representing all five categories for the first 11 questions, including, in particular, the 'not appropriate' column as well as the tabulated responses for all questions and Table IV providing the percentage distribution positively and negatively of those who responded to the first 11 questions.

One third of the juniors felt that neither the question of discussing their major with their departmental adviser nor the question of assistance from their department chairmen were appropriate questions for them.

While the juniors most strongly believed they were in the right major, 96.2%, they were supportive of the departmental adviser on matters of academic policies, 77%, general college, 77.3%, major requirements, 88.8%, and the department chairmen when sought out, 71.7%. They were rather evenly divided on the helpfulness of the adviser's advice on choice of major, 49.2%, career plans, 50%, as well as the availability of the Coordinator of Academic Advising for assistance, 52.4%. Though in question 10 they were almost evenly divided on the preference

Table III. Adjusted frequency percentage of perceptions of junior class for all respondents questionnaire 1976.

Question	Agree	Strongly Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
1.	28.4	11.8	36.3	14.7	8.8
2.	52.4	20.4	16.5	4.9	5.8
3.	54.9	31.4	6.9	3.9	2.9
4.	52.4	43.8	3.8		
5.	20.8	10.9	21.8	10.9	35.6
6.	17.2	20.2	24.2	13.1	25.3
7.	35.3	20.6	8.8	7.8	27.5
8.	27.5	19.6	11.8	6.9	34.3
9.	38.8	6.1	24.5	15.3	15.3
10.	31.1	14.6	27.2	19.4	7.8
11.	14.6	6.8	35.0	36.9	6.8

12.	Advisor	52.9	Other Faculty	12.7	Students	31.4	Counseling Office	2.9
13.	Almost Never	12.4	Prior to registration	36.2	Various times	51.4		
14.	Yes	70.5	No	29.5				
15.	Sometimes	7.5	Not at all	92.5				
16.	A lot	52.8	Sometimes	38.7	Not at all	8.5		
17.	A lot	37.5	Sometimes	52.9	Not at all	9.6		
18.	Department	63.4	Staff	36.6				
19.	Division	59.2	Student	40.8				
20.	Life	82.2	Job	17.8				

Table IV. Percentage of junior perceptions for respondents who answered questions in 1976 survey.

	Agree	Disagree
1.	44.1	55.9
2.	77.3	22.7
3.	88.9	11.1
4.	96.2	3.8
5.	49.2	50.8
6.	50	50
7.	77	23
8.	71.7	28.3
9.	52.4	47.6
10.	49.5	50.5
11.	22.9	77.1

Table V. Results of chi square test on 15 questions crosstabulated by year for commonly shared questions for freshmen and juniors 1976 survey. 28

Question	chi square=	Degree of Freedom
1. Pleased with academic advising at college	11.73753*	3
2. Advisor aware of requirements and helpful	7.59981	3
3. Advisor aware of major requirements	3.13674	3
4. Right major	4.66878	3
5. Discussed choice of major with advisor	.68697	3
6. Discussed career plans with advisor	10.18658*	3
7. Advisor aware of college policies	1.93512	3
8. Department chairmen helpful	.46684	3
9. Help from Coordinator of Academic Advising	3.43522	3
10. Seek own advisor over others	4.37017	3
11. Prefer new structured program	4.05338	3
12. Most useful academic advising form	2.92164	3
13. When you seek academic advice	10.23535*	2
14. Aware of career counseling center	16.21157*	1
15. Used career counseling center	3.55453	2

* Significant difference at 5% level of significance

1 Degree of freedom 3.84146

2 Degrees of freedom 5.99147

3 Degrees of freedom 7.81473

Table VI. Results of chi square test on 7 questions crosstabulted by year for commonly shared questions of present junior class with their responses in 1974 survey.

Question	chi square=	Degree of Freedom
1. Pleased with academic advising	7.50722*	1
2. General college requirements	7.9292 *	1
3. Major requirements	2.20219	1
4. Right major	11.5947 *	1
5. Career plans with advisor	1.02914	1
6. Most useful advice from	12.5141 *	3
7. When you seek academic advice	4.69351	2

* Significant difference at 5% level of significance

1. Degree of freedom 3.84146
2. Degrees of freedom 5.99147
3. Degrees of freedom 7.81473

for their departmental adviser, 49.5%, in questions 17, 52.9%, 18, 63.4%, 19, 59.2% they indicated their preference for the faculty adviser over potential staff or student advisers.

The juniors most negative responses concerned the use of the counseling center, 92.5%, followed by a 77.1% rejection of a more structured curriculum and a 55.9% displeasure with the academic advising at the college.

In the comparison of the 15 questions shared in common by the freshmen and junior classes in the 1976 survey the results are summarized in Table V. Significant differences at the 5% level were indicated in four questions: the first, where the freshmen indicated pleasure with the academic advising system and the juniors did not; the second, on the advisers' helpfulness with career plans, the juniors were evenly divided while the freshmen were negative; the third, the difference on <u>when</u> they sought advice, the freshmen indicated primarily "prior to registration" and the juniors "various times"; fourth, on their awareness of the Career Counseling Center the freshmen indicated they were less aware of the Center than the juniors.

Table VI presents the results of the seven questions answered by the juniors in the 1974 and 1976 questionnaires. Four questions revealed a significant difference at the 5% level. The first, on the question of pleasure with

academic advising, represented a negative answer for this year whereas the 1974 survey answer was positive; the second; on the advisers' knowledge of general college requirements the juniors were more positive in the 1974 study; the third, as to whether the students were in the right major, the juniors were much more positive this time, and the fourth, on from whom they received the most useful advice, they found the faculty in 1976 rather than the students as in the 1974 survey.

V. DISCUSSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In the overall assessment of the academic advising program of the college it was encouraging to note that there was continued approval of the assistance of the departmental adviser in the general college and major requirements. Since this is an area of prime responsibility for the advisers it is an important requisite for the success of the program. This success would appear to be traceable in part to the excellent work done by the registrar's office in clearly delineating the major requirements in the catalog, the check-off sheets developed by the departments for this purpose and the pre-registration materials which spell out in great detail the general college requirements as well as the advisers' own efforts over the last five semesters. The effort of the registrar's office to cooperate with the academic advising program has considerably expanded since the inception of the faculty program over two and one-half years ago.

There were two questions which sought to test the students' awareness of their own condition and position, in a sense, "Catch Twenty-Two" questions: the first questioned whether they were in the right major and the second whether they preferred a more structured major. Since it would be assumed a person would switch his major

if he believed he was in the wrong one and since the students have traditionally rejected a more structured program it was felt these questions could be used as a double check on their close attention to what was being asked in the survey. The strength with which they agreed to the first and rejected the second was reassuring as to their attention on what was being asked.

Related to the students' perceptions on from whom they would seek academic advice previous studies cited earlier stressed students' preference for professional counselors or peer counselors. Both classes surveyed indicated their continued preference for faculty advising which would lead us to qualify our recommendations in this area since in the previous Bridgewater survey the students had indicated they had received their most useful academic advising from their fellow students and had raised the question of the implementation of peer advising. Additionally, both classes were positive in their awareness of assistance from the Coordinator of Academic Advising and the department chairmen, a part of the advising program which is necessary to help those who appear to have been left stranded.

On the specific question for the freshmen on the declaration of major the freshmen clearly indicated they understood they had entered as undeclared and were pleased with the assistance offered them for their choice, though the number who refrained from answering that ques-

tion may explain their other indication of displeasure on the choice of major which will be dealt with below. It should be noted that there had been concern that the freshmen had not understood the declaration of major process and this finding will counteract that impression.

There were three areas in the survey which indicated points of weakness in the program which should be addressed. The first is a carry over from the first study, a weakness in the career assistance from the adviser was evidenced by both classes, the second, the non-use of the Career Counseling Center by both classes while the freshmen indicated a lack of knowledge of its existence, and the third, the weakness of the advisers when it came to choice of major. Parenthetically, since these were the essentially negative areas of the study the juniors' displeasure with the system must be traced here.

The non-use of the Career Counseling Center may be traced in part to the fact that most Bridgewater students do not appear to become concerned with their career plans until their senior year. As suggested by Hadley in his article, the Career Counseling Center is ideally located in the Student Union and additionally is sponsored by student government funds and the career counselor is a very personable lady who is very willing to help. Since the students continue to cite difficulties in the assistance offered by faculty in this area attention must

be given to it in these recommendations as well as to the assistance available on the choice of major. While the freshmen indicated they received assistance for their initial declaration of major it would appear reasonable that their career apprehensions were reflected in their concern over assistance within their major since the vast majority stated they believed they were in the right major.

It would be recommended that the departments be encouraged to continue to develop up-dated check off sheets for their majors. This process has been very successful in those departments which have revised them for each registration and has been a weakness for those who have not. It is reasonable to assume that most departments will be able to follow through on this proposal.

The second recommendation concerns itself with the faculty advising loads. Within the Division of Professional Education the number of students per faculty member is much higher than in other divisions. Prior to this study, recognizing the many successful excursions into peer advising it had been contemplated making recommendations that they be used in the Division of Professional Education. However, in light of the clear preference of the students for faculty advisers it would be recommended that the faculty from the Secondary Education Department, who are not presently assigned advisees, be used to lighten the advising load of other departments within the division. Dr. Harper, the divisional director, is in

agreement with this recommendation.

Thirdly, in cooperation with the student government, every effort will be made to draw more attention to the Career Counseling Center. The student newspaper and radio station are willing to cooperate in this effort but it must be buttressed by the academic departments. This leads to recommendation four, that each department hold periodic meetings with their majors on the career options available to them as well as the implications of their choice of major. Since this has already been recommended to the Academic Dean and seconded by him it is realistic to recognize success will be based on continual encouragement of the departments. Since the career counselor is willing to be of assistance to the departments it would be recommended that periodic mailings be sent to each department from the career counselor with materials appropriate to their department. Additionally, it would be recommended that the career counselor meet with each department and their majors at least once in the fall semester of the year as this would bring even more visibility to that office. One obvious drawback for this program is that in a Liberal Arts institution some faculty do not feel a responsibility toward the career plans of their students and this means that some students are forced to rely on the good nature of faculty members who are not their advisers for career assistance. This last recommendation is also intended to address the

weakness expressed on advice concerning major field choices since the implication of the above recommendation would by its nature force the students and faculty to address the implications of one's major when discussing careers.

As the negative aspect of the literature search indicated every college has problems connected with academic advising programs. The initial study two years ago provided data on which to make recommendations to strengthen the program. These efforts have been rewarded with the results cited above, with the student government providing funds for a Career Counseling Center, with improved faculty knowledge of the system and excellent cooperation from the office of the registrar. If the above recommendations of this study are carried out the system will be made stronger which will be to the benefit of the students. All of the recommendations can be implemented within the present structure and do not call for any unusual steps and additionally have the blessing of the various parties concerned. It has been the desire of the Academic Dean and the Academic Standing Committee that the program be strengthened. In the context of "Learning Theory and Application" Losak's dictum of the need to assist people to learn at different rates and different ways suggests a clear need for a more personal advising system. The recommendations which have been suggested should help to bring this about as they

are a result of the students' perceptions in a system which is after all intended to help facilitate their learning by dealing with them on a more personal basis. It should take into account that the personality variables of the learner are important in the acquisition of learning and the faculty adviser must be aware of this when he deals with them.

These recommendations take into account several basic principles of learning suggested by Malcolm Knowles. The first recommendation has at its heart the principle that the advisor shares his thinking about options available in the designing of learning experiences while the advisee accepts a share of the responsibility for planning and operating his learning experiences. Similarly, the second recommendation rests on the learning principle that the faculty advisors help the students to organize to share responsibility in the process of mutual inquiry. As this revision is being submitted a faculty subcommittee in Special Education has begun an inquiry on how to address the heavy advising load of that department and in view of this study to reassign others to assist.

The third and fourth recommendations rest on the principle that in assisting the student with career planning it enables the learner to perceive the goals of the learning experience to be his own goals while at the same time the learner has a sense of progress toward these goals.

VI. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Hardee, Melvene D., Faculty Advising in Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C.: American Personnel and Guidance Association, 21.

Losak, John, Learning Theory and Application, Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova University, 1974, 41.

Nie, Norman, Hull, Hadlia, Jenkins, Jean, Steinbrenner, Karin, Bent, Dale, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975, 223-4.

O'Banion, Terry and Thurston, Alice, Student Development Programs in the Community Junior College, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1972, 173.

Symonds, Percival M., What Education Has to Learn From Psychology, (3rd edition) New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1970, 9.

Periodicals

Borland, David, "Curricular Planning Through Creative Academic Advising", NASPA Journal, 10:211-17.

Donk, Leonard J. and Getting, Eugene R., "Student-Faculty Relations and the Faculty Advising System", Journal of College Student Personnel, 1968,9: 402.

Gelwick, Beverly, "Training Faculty to Do Career Advising", The Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 53, No. 3, 214-217.

Hadley, Everett E., "Helping Faculty Advisers Deal With Vocational Indecision", Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 1975, 23, 232-236.

Healy, Charles, "Furthering Career Education Through Counseling", The Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 52, No. 10, 1974, 657.

Jones, Twyman, "The Counselor and His Role", Junior College Journal, 1970, 40:12.

Periodicals (cont.)

Meadows, Mark E., "Assessment of College Counseling: A Follow-Up Study", Journal of Counseling Psychology, Vol. 22, No.6, 1975, 463.

Ravekes, John E., "Development and Evaluation of Essex Community College's Revised Academic Advising System", NASPA Journal, 8:242.

Robertson, James H. "Academic Advising in Colleges and Universities--Its Present State and Present Problems", North Central Association Quarterly, 32, 1958, 228-39.

Sanborn, Carleton, H., and Taylor, Alton L., "Predicting Faculty Interest in Student Advising in the Community College", Research in Higher Education, 1975, 3, 67-75.

Scott, Stephen, and Warner, Richard, "Peer Counseling", The Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 53, No. 3, 1974, 228-231.

Spille, Henry, and Stein, Gordon, "Academic Advising Reaches Out", The Personnel and Guidance Journal, Vol. 53, No. 1, 1974, 61.

Newspapers

The Chronicle of Higher Education, May 17, 1976, 32.

Government Documents

Alfaro, Edward and others, A Comparative Study of Academic Advisement by Instructors and Credentialed Counselors Related to Freshmen at Two Community Colleges, ERIC, ED 094 807 (Nova University, Fort Lauderdale, Florida, 1974.).

Brown, Coke R., Evaluation of a College Curriculum Advisory Program Utilizing Student Advisers, ERIC, ED 063 906 (Idaho University, Pocatello, Idaho, 1972) 5.

Shelton, Joe B., A Comparison of Faculty Academic Advising and Academic Advising by Professional Counselors, ERIC, ED 065 088 (Johnson County Community College, Shawnee Mission, Kansas, 1972) 1.

Unpublished Materials

Baumgardner, S. R., Rappoport, L., "Conflicts in Career Thinking: Analytic Advisers and Intuitive Students", Paper at Southwestern Psychological Association, El Paso, May 1974, 17pp.

Douglas, Dwight, and Hallenbech, Daniel, "The Resident Assistant as Academic Adviser: A Model Program for Efficient Student Development", Paper at NASPA conference, Dallas, March 29, 1976.

Appendix A.

STUDENT EVALUATION OF THE ACADEMIC ADVISING SYSTEM

Major Department_____

Instructions: There are five possible answers for each question, please circle the one which is most appropriate for you:
1 - Agree
2 - Strongly agree
3 - Disagree
4 - Strongly disagree
5 - Not appropriate

1.	I am pleased with the academic advising at the college.	1 2 3 4 5
2.	My departmental advisor was aware of the general college requirements and able to assist me with them.	1 2 3 4 5
3.	My departmental advisor was aware of the major requirements of my department and able to assist me with them.	1 2 3 4 5
4.	I believe I am in the right major.	1 2 3 4 5
5.	I have discussed my choice of major with my departmental advisor and the discussion was helpful.	1 2 3 4 5
6.	I have discussed my career plans with my departmental advisor and the discussion was helpful.	1 2 3 4 5
7.	When I consulted my advisor on academic policies such as "Drop-Add," "W's" or the like he was aware of the policies of the college.	1 2 3 4 5
8.	When an academic problem was beyond the control of my advisor my chairman was helpful.	1 2 3 4 5
9.	I am aware that I may obtain assistance on academic questions or problems from the Coordinator of Academic Advising.	1 2 3 4 5
10.	When an academic question or problem arisesI would seek assistance from my advisor rather than another faculty member, fellow student or college staff member.	1 2 3 4 5
11.	I would rather a more structured program which would reduce the necessity of academic advising.	1 2 3 4 5

Please circle the appropriate answer for the following questions:

12. From whom did you receive the most useful academic advising in terms of correctness and policy rather than in terms of the ease of the course or the personality of the teacher?

Departmental advisor Other faculty member Students Counseling office staff

13. When do you seek academic advise?

Almost never Prior to registration Various times

--SEE REVERSE SIDE FOR REMAINING QUESTIONS.

14. Are you aware that there is a Career Counseling Center in the Student Union which is available to assist you?

Yes No

15. Have you used the Career Counseling Center for assistance?

A lot Sometimes Not at all

16. Were you aware that all freshmen enter as undeclared majors with an "area of interest" and that you must formally declare your major after entrance?

Yes No

17. Did you seek the assistance of your department or advisor for this choice?

Yes No

18. If you answered Yes to question 17, did you find such assistance of help to you in your choice of major?

Yes No

19. If you were to strengthen the academic advising system would you prefer to be counseled by

A faculty member of your department Professional staff

20. If an advisor from your department was not available would you prefer to be counseled by

A faculty member from your division A student trained by your department

STUDENT EVALUATION OF THE ACADEMIC ADVISING SYSTEM

Major Department_____

Instructions: There are five possible answers for each question, please circle the one which is most appropriate for you:
1 - Agree
2 - Strongly agree
3 - Disagree
4 - Strongly disagree
5 - Not appropriate

1.	I am pleased with the academic advising at the college.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	My departmental advisor was aware of the general college requirements and able to assist me with them.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	My departmental advisor was aware of the major requirements of my department and able to assist me with them.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	I believe I am in the right major.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	I have discussed my choice of major with my departmental advisor and the discussion was helpful.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	I have discussed my career plans with my departmental advisor and the discussion was helpful.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	When I consulted my advisor on academic policies such as "Drop-Add," "W's" or the like he was aware of the policies of the college.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	When an academic problem was beyond the control of my advisor my chairman was helpful.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	I am aware that I may obtain assistance on academic questions or problems from the Coordinator of Academic Advising.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	When an academic question or problem arisesI would seek assistance from my advisor rather than another faculty member, fellow student or college staff member.	1	2	3	4	5
11.	I would rather a more structured program which would reduce the necessity of academic advising.	1	2	3	4	5

Please circle the appropriate answer for the following questions:

12. From whom did you receive the most useful academic advising in terms of correctness and policy rather than in terms of the ease of the coarse or the personality of the teacher?

Departmental advisor Other faculty member Students Counseling office staff

13. When do you seek academic advise?

Almost never Prior to registration Various times

14. Are you aware that there is a Career Counseling Center in the Student Union which is available to assist you?

Yes No

15. Have you used the Career Counseling Center for assistance?

A lot Sometimes Not at all

16. Have you given much consideration and thought to career planning?

17. Have you considered graduate school?

A lot Sometimes Not at all

18. If you were to strengthen the academic advising system would you prefer to be counseled by

A faculty member of your department Professional staff

19. If an advisor from your department was not available would you prefer to be counseled by

A faculty member from your division A student trained by your department

20. Do you believe you are educating yourself for life or a job?

Life Job